

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed June 15, 2004, the Examiner rejected claims 1-5 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,315,621 (“Natori et al”), rejected claims 6, 7, and 9-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Natori et al. in view of United States Patent No. 6,688,893 (“Huang et al”) and rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Natori et al.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Natori et al. A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegall Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of Calif.*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Because Natori et al does not recite each and every element set forth in claims 1-5 and 17, Natori et al does not anticipate the subject matter recited in those claims.

Independent claim 1 recites a land grid array connector comprising, *inter alia*, a housing having a first surface and a second surface, the housing having a passageway provided therethrough which extends from the first surface to the second surface, the passageway having a recess proximate to the first surface of the housing, the recess being sized and configured to limit lateral deflection of the terminal tip upon deformation of the deformable portion in a lateral direction.

Natori et al does not disclose, teach or suggest a recess being sized and configured to limit lateral deflection of the terminal tip. Rather, to the extent the Natori et al housing is disclosed with any particularity, it teaches that the insulator 230 includes a vertical wall 231 to press fit the contact element 51 to support the contact element and a cavity 233 that allows the elastic arm portion 55 of the contact element 51 to be freely deformable and displaceable. Thus, there is no teaching in Natori et al that either the vertical wall or the cavity limits the displacement of the terminal, an in particular in the lateral direction. Rather, the vertical wall 231 is disclosed for the purpose of having structure in which the terminal can be retained within the insulator 230, and the cavity 233, rather than performing any limiting function, allows for complete deformation and displacement. Thus, for at least this reason, Natori et al does not anticipate claim 1 of the present invention. As claims 2-5 and 17 ultimately depend from claim 1, claims 2-5 and 17 are likewise not anticipated by Natori et al for at least this reason. As such, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-5 and 17 as being anticipated by Natori et al.

The Examiner rejected claims 6, 7 and 9-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Natori et al in view of Huang et al. Because the combination of Natori et al and Huang et al does not set forth every element of claims 6, 7 and 9-16, the combination of Natori et al and Huang et al does not present a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Claims 6, 7 and 9-16 ultimately depend from claim 1. As stated previously in regards to claim 1, Natori et al fails to disclose, teach or suggest structure that limits the lateral deflection of the terminal. As the Examiner states that the teaching of Huang et al is an S shaped terminal, the combination of Natori et al and Huang et al does not disclose, teach or suggest structure that limits lateral deflection. As such, the combination of Natori et al and Huang et al does not present a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 6, 7 and 9-16 as being unpatentable over Natori et al in view of Huang et al.

The Examiner rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Natori et al. Because Natori et al does not set forth every element of claim 8, Natori et al does not present a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Claim 8 depends from claim 1. As stated previously in regards to claim 1, Natori et al fails to disclose, teach or suggest structure that limits the lateral deflection of the terminal. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 8 as being unpatentable over Natori et al.

The applicant made the following prior art of record, but did not rely on it: United States Patent No. 6,652,329 (“Howell et al”), United States Patent No. 6,406,305 (“Wu”), United States Patent No. 6,695,624 (“Szu”), United States Patent No. 6,674,018 (“Yumi”) and United States Patent No. 6,585,527 (“Koopman et al”). None of these references, either taken alone or in combination, recite the land grid array connector recited in the claims of the present invention.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejections in light of the above remarks, and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conversation would facilitate the prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is invited to call applicant’s attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

MOLEX INCORPORATED

Date: September 15, 2004

By: 
Robert J. Zeitzer
Registration No. 37,973

Mailing Address:
MOLEX INCORPORATED
2222 Wellington Court
Lisle, Illinois 60532
Tel.: (630) 527-4884
Fax.: (630) 416-4962